

1 EDMUND G. BROWN JR.  
2 Attorney General of the State of California  
3 DANE R. GILLETTE  
4 Chief Assistant Attorney General  
5 JULIE L. GARLAND  
6 Senior Assistant Attorney General  
7 JENNIFER A. NEILL  
8 Supervising Deputy Attorney General  
9 AMANDA J. MURRAY, State Bar No. 223829  
10 Deputy Attorney General  
11 455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 11000  
12 San Francisco, CA 94102-7004  
13 Telephone: (415) 703-5741  
14 Fax: (415) 703-5843  
15 Email: Amanda.Murray@doj.ca.gov

Attorneys for Respondent

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

EDWARD PALACIOS,

Petitioner,

C08-2000 VRW

**ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER,**

**Respondent.**

**RESPONDENT'S REQUEST  
FOR STAY PENDING  
ISSUANCE OF THE  
MANDATE IN *HAYWARD*  
OR, IN THE ALTERNATIVE,  
REQUEST FOR AN  
EXTENSION OF TIME;  
[PROPOSED] ORDERS**

Courtroom: 1  
Judge: The Honorable  
Vaughn R. Walker

## INTRODUCTION

23 Petitioner filed a Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus, contending that his due process rights  
24 were violated by Governor Schwarzenegger's 2005 decision finding him unsuitable for parole.  
25 The Court ordered a response to the Petition. On May 16, 2008, the Ninth Circuit granted en  
26 banc review in *Hayward v. Marshall*, 527 F.3d 797 (9th Cir. 2008). Oral argument was heard on  
27 June 24, 2008. The en banc court in *Hayward* may decide whether this Court has jurisdiction  
28 over this case, and the appropriate standard to be applied if there is jurisdiction. Therefore,

**Req. for Stay**

*Palacios v. Schwarzenegger*  
C08-2000 VRW

1 Respondent requests a stay of this case pending the issuance of the mandate in *Hayward*.

2 **ARGUMENT**

3 **I.**

4 **THE COURT SHOULD EXERCISE ITS DISCRETION AND STAY THIS  
5 MATTER PENDING ISSUANCE OF THE MANDATE IN *HAYWARD*  
6 BECAUSE BOTH THE BALANCE OF THE INTERESTS AND  
7 CONSIDERATIONS OF JUDICIAL ORDER AND ECONOMY FAVOR  
8 GRANTING A STAY.**

9 A trial court has discretion to ensure the just and efficient determination of a case by  
10 staying it pending the resolution of other proceedings where a stay would be “efficient for [the  
11 court’s] docket and the fairest course for the parties.” *Leyva v. Certified Grocers of Cal.*,  
12 593 F.2d 857, 863 (9th Cir. 1979). In determining whether to grant a stay, a court should  
13 consider the possible damage that may result, the hardship or inequity that a party may suffer,  
14 and the orderly course of justice, in terms of simplifying or complicating the issues, proof, and  
15 questions of law, that could result from the issuance of a stay. *Lockyer v. Mirant Corp.*, 398 F.3d  
16 1098, 1109, 1111 (9th Cir. 2005). A court should also take into account the existence of similar  
17 cases that are pending in the same district court, and the probability that more are likely to be  
18 filed. *Id.* Staying cases that are on the forefront of an issue provides a necessary delay, allowing  
19 for resolution of the issues and resulting in uniform treatment of like suits. *Id.*

20 As the resolution of *Hayward* could significantly impact this case and numerous similar  
21 cases and issuing a stay would prevent unfairness and serve the interests of judicial economy, the  
22 Court should exercise its discretion and stay this matter pending the issuance of the mandate in  
23 *Hayward*.

24 **A. Moving Forward with This Case Before the Finality of  
25 *Hayward* Does Not Serve the Interest of Judicial Economy.**

26 Granting a stay in this case serves the interests of judicial order and economy. On May  
27 16, 2008, the Ninth Circuit granted rehearing en banc in *Hayward*. (Ex. 1.) At issue before the  
28 en banc panel in *Hayward* are two threshold issues which are necessary to the resolution of this  
case: 1) whether California has created a federally protected liberty interest in parole for life  
inmates, and 2) if a liberty interest is created, what process is due under clearly established

1 Supreme Court authority. Resolution of these issues could establish that Petitioner does not have  
 2 a federally protected liberty interest in parole, potentially allowing the Court to dismiss his  
 3 claims for lack of jurisdiction without requiring briefing from the parties. Moreover, it would be  
 4 wasteful to proceed in this case without the Ninth Circuit's holdings in these matters, as the  
 5 parties would need to brief issues that will be decided *en banc* and then submit supplemental  
 6 briefing to apply the law as clarified in the *en banc* decision. The two rounds of pleadings may  
 7 unnecessarily complicate the matters raised and would impair the orderly course of justice.  
 8 Waiting for the resolution of *Hayward* would thus conserve Court resources, and prevent the  
 9 Court from having to revisit this matter if *Hayward* is modified or reversed.

10 A stay would also serve judicial order and economy by maintaining uniform treatment of  
 11 like suits, as once the law is settled it can be uniformly applied. In many habeas petitions  
 12 challenging California parole decisions, the Ninth Circuit has sua sponte stayed submission of  
 13 the cases until the resolution of *Hayward*. See, e.g., *Tolliver v. Carey*, no. 07-15347; *Boatman v.*  
 14 *Brown*, no. 05-16199; *Smiley v. Hernandez*, no. 06-55727; *Valdivia v. Brown*, no. 08-15650;  
 15 *Johnson v. Newland*, no. 04-16712; *Varner v. Brown*, no. 05-16029; *Johnson v. Finn*, no. 06-  
 16 17042; *Clark v. Shepherd*, no. 06-55065; *Cooke v. Solis*, no. 06-15444.

17 Granting a stay would therefore conserve judicial resources and serve the Court's interest  
 18 in orderly managing these proceedings.

19       **B.     A Stay Would Not Unfairly Delay Petitioner in Pursuing His Claims.**

20       A stay of this case at the district level would not unfairly impose any additional or  
 21 otherwise avoidable hardship on Petitioner. As discussed above, if the parties proceed in this  
 22 case additional briefing will likely be needed after the decision in *Hayward*, perhaps delaying  
 23 final resolution. Also, even if this court decides this case before *Hayward*, it is likely the losing  
 24 party will file an appeal, and that appeal may be delayed pending resolution of *Hayward*. (See  
 25 Arg. I.A.)

26 //

27 //

28 //

Req. for Stay

*Palacios v. Schwarzenegger*  
C08-2000 VRW

## CONCLUSION

When the equities are balanced, the parties' interests and the interests of judicial economy support staying this case pending the final resolution of *Hayward*. Staying this case until challenges to *Hayward* are resolved and that decision becomes final promotes the orderly resolution of this matter, and will assist in maintaining uniformity of like suits pending before this Court and similar cases that will be filed in the future. Respondent therefore requests that the Court exercise its discretion to stay this matter pending issuance of the mandate in *Hayward*. In the alternative and if this request is denied, Respondent respectfully seeks a sixty day extension of time from the date the Court's denial is served on the Attorney General's Office to file the Answer.

Dated: August 11, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

EDMUND G. BROWN JR.  
Attorney General of the State of California

DANE R. GILLETTE  
Chief Assistant Attorney General

JULIE L. GARLAND  
Senior Assistant Attorney General

JENNIFER A. NEILL  
Supervising Deputy Attorney General

~~AMANDA J. MURRAY  
Deputy Attorney General  
Attorneys for Respondent~~

20130952.wpd

**DECLARATION OF SERVICE BY U.S. MAIL**

Case Name: **Palacios v. Schwarzenegger**

No.: **C08-2000 VRW**

I declare:

I am employed in the Office of the Attorney General, which is the office of a member of the California State Bar, at which member's direction this service is made. I am 18 years of age or older and not a party to this matter. I am familiar with the business practice at the Office of the Attorney General for collection and processing of correspondence for mailing with the United States Postal Service. In accordance with that practice, correspondence placed in the internal mail collection system at the Office of the Attorney General is deposited with the United States Postal Service that same day in the ordinary course of business.

On August 11, 2008, I served the attached

**RESPONDENT'S REQUEST FOR STAY PENDING ISSUANCE OF THE MANDATE IN HAYWARD OR, IN THE ALTERNATIVE, REQUEST FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME; [PROPOSED] ORDERS**

**[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING RESPONDENT'S REQUEST FOR A STAY PENDING ISSUANCE OF MANDATE IN HAYWARD**

**[PROPOSED] ORDER DENYING RESPONDENT'S REQUEST FOR A STAY AND GRANTING RESPONDENT'S REQUEST FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME**

by placing a true copy thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope with postage thereon fully prepaid, in the internal mail collection system at the Office of the Attorney General at 455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 11000, San Francisco, CA 94102-7004, addressed as follows:

**Edward Palacios, D-27035  
Correctional Training Facility  
P.O. Box 689  
Soledad, CA 93960-0686  
in pro per**

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed on **August 11, 2008**, at San Francisco, California.

---

M.M. Argarin  
Declarant

---

*M.M. Argarin*  
Signature

# **EXHIBIT 1**

**FILED**

**FOR PUBLICATION**

MAY 16 2008

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK  
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

RONALD HAYWARD,

No. 06-55392

Petitioner - Appellant,

D.C. No. CV-05-07239-GAF(CT)

v.

JOHN MARSHALL, California Men's  
Colony East,

ORDER

Respondent - Appellee.

**KOZINSKI**, Chief Judge:

Upon the vote of a majority of nonrecused active judges, it is ordered that this case be reheard en banc pursuant to Circuit Rule 35-3. The three-judge panel opinion shall not be cited as precedent by or to any court of the Ninth Circuit.